11-17-04

AF/2154

DOCKET NO.: RA-5373

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:	Confirmation No.: **1674**
Horton, John, C., et al.	Docket No. **RA-5373**
Serial No.: **09/738,852**	Group Art Unit: **2154**
Filing Date: **12/15/2000**	Examiner: **Siddiqi, Mohammad A.**

For: **CONTROLLING ACCESS TO VERSIONS OF APPLICATION SOFTWARE BY A SERVER, BASED ON SITE ID**

Mail Stop Appeal-Brief Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

This brief is being filed in support of Appellant's appeal from the rejections of claims 1-18 dated 05/18/2004. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 08/18/2004. This appeal brief is being filed with a request for extension of time with fee payment, making this brief timely.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment of the required processing fee in the amount of **$340.00** to Deposit Account No. 19-3790. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

11/19/2004 AWONDAF1 00000093 193790 09738852
01 FC:1402 340.00 DA

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

UNISYS CORPORATION is the real party in interest in the present application. The inventors in the present application assigned their interest to UNISYS CORPORATION on December 14, 2000. A copy of the assignment accompanies this brief as EXHIBIT A of the Appendix.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-18 stand rejected. Claims 1-11 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 USC Section 102(e), over a U.S. patent issued to Madrane et al., with patent number 6,573,907 (Madrane). Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for obviousness over Madrane in view of another US patent, Number 5,974,430, issued to Mutschler (Mutschler). The rejection of Claims 1-18 is appealed.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

A listing of claims is provided in the APPENDIX, EXHIBIT B below. Claims that have never been amended (namely, claims 1-13, 15-18) are marked as "original." Claims that have been modified by entered amendments (namely, claim 14) are marked as "Previously Presented." No claims were amended after final as the characterization of the main reference, Madrane, appears to require complete resolution before progress can be made on resolution of the allowance of the pending claims.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is reproduced below for ease of reference.

1. A System for assigning each one of a plurality of versions of a software application to specific requests from specific users handled by a server, wherein more than one of said plurality of versions of a said software application is available to service requests from users on said server, and wherein said specific users are provided access to said server by issuing requests to said server, and wherein said requests have a SiteID code in each said request, said system comprising:

a network listening program for receiving said requests by said users for use of a said software application program version,

a table on said server containing correspondences between ones of a plurality of sites and ones of said SiteID codes said correspondences logically connecting a one of said more than one version of a said software application program to a one of said plurality of sites indicated by said SiteID code, wherein said one of said plurality of sites has only one of said more than one version of a said software application program and at least one data area,

an access control manager program for determining which one of said more than one version of a said software application program should be connected to each user request by reference to said table,

a linking program for linking said a request to a site.

Claims 1, 13 and 14 are independent claims but they all have features the Examiner has stated appear in combination in Madrane but which the Appellant firmly believes do not exist in Madrane combined as they are in the claims. These elements are Software Applications, and the existence of a correspondence between SiteID codes and the Software Application versions.

The purpose of the invention is to ensure that appropriate users at appropriate sites have access to the right versions of software applications. This

purpose is seen in the claims preambles. (See claim 1 preamble reproduced above for example). The reason this is important is detailed in the ABSTRACT. (A copy of the ABSTRACT is in the Appendix as EXHIBIT C). The Madrane reference does not provide for the support of versions of software being accessed in accord with SiteID codes, instead it provides for handling versions of data, specifically image data. And, although Madrane does mention different versions of applications software, it does NOT teach how to manage those versions based on SiteIDs.

ELEMENTS OF CLAIMS DEFINED AS FOUND IN THE SPECIFICATION

1 "Software Application Program" or "Software Application"

This couplet appears no less than 6 times in independent claims 1 and 13 and three times in independent claim 14. It is the thing the invention we are considering was built to deal with. How to handle making sure specific requests for versions of software applications from specific users get serviced by the right versions of such software applications and not by wrong versions for those requests or those users. Madrane does not address software application version handling. Instead it is directed to "Interactive interfaces to video information ...arranged such that ...The user can manipulate the displayed image by designating different viewing positions, selecting portions of the video information for playback and by special effects, such as cutting open the quasi-object for a better view. We specify this first to provide contrast to what this element "software application" is within the claims of the applicant. (Madrane, ABSTRACT, APPENDIX EXHIBIT D).

Software applications can be defined in general as applications that are enabled by software. In the Merriam-Webster on-line dictionary "application" is defined thus;

Main Entry: **ap·pli·ca·tion**

Pronunciation: "a-pl&-'kA-sh&n
Function: *noun*
Etymology: Middle English *applicacioun,* from Latin *application-, applicatio* inclination, from *applicare*
1 : an act of applying: **a** (1) **:** an act of putting to use <*application* of new techniques> (2) **:** a use to which something is put <new *applications* for old remedies> **(3) : a program (as a word processor or a spreadsheet) that performs one of the important tasks for which a computer is used b :** an act of administering or superposing <*application* of paint to a house> **c :** assiduous attention <succeeds by *application* to her studies>
2 a : REQUEST, PETITION <an *application* for financial aid> **b :** a form used in making a request
3 : the practical inference to be derived from a discourse (as a moral tale)
4 : a medicated or protective layer or material <an oily *application* for dry skin>
5 : capacity for practical use <words of varied *application*>

A more relevant definition is found in Webopedia at.

http://www.pcwebopaedia.com/TERM/a/application.html :

A program or group of programs designed for end users. Software can be divided into two general classes: *systems software* and *applications software.* Systems software consists of low-level programs that interact with the computer at a very basic level. This includes operating systems, compilers, and utilities for managing computer resources.
In contrast, applications software (also called *end-user programs*) includes database programs, word processors, and spreadsheets. Figuratively speaking, applications software sits on top of systems software because it is unable to run without the operating system and system utilities.

These are very common terms and there is nothing in the application suggesting that they have different meaning, such as the meaning suggested by the Examiner, which is examined in the Argument Section below.

It is an obligation of the Appellant under the new rules for writing appeal briefs to show where terms in the claims that are at issue in the Appeal are defined in the specification. In the patent application that forms the basis for this appeal there are 11 mentions of software application, and 10 mentions of application software, plus one more each in the title and abstract. It is submitted that their use is substantially interchangeable in the context of this application,

and that no one of these 22 uses differs in any substantial respect from the common definitions copied above, and that no one of these mentions provides a comprehensive definition. A software application example is given in the patent application as the Unisys software application program MAPPER, as indicated at the top of page 4 of the application:

> In the first instance of the inventors' use of this invention, MAPPER™ software was used on a Unisys server platform, and levels 6 and 7 were simultaneously made available for users. There are different types of users which use MAPPER software. Whether it is a developer level user or an application user level user, the principles of this invention apply with equal force to permit multiple versions of the MAPPER or other user accessible software to be used simultaneously on a single server without forcing all versions to be upgraded.
>
> MAPPER is a well known application software program and is briefly described in the paragraph below, from a current webpage http://www.ubsinc.com/experience/mf.html#map :

From functional analysis to design, development, implementation and post-implementation support, UPP consultants have the technical expertise necessary to develop, implement and support large-scale MAPPER applications. UPP personnel have been critical to a state government client's COBOL and MAPPER development and MAPPER to Oracle and Oracle Financials conversion efforts, including all aspects of system development, MAPPER Run Design and project management. Company resources have also been involved in a project to convert Unisys COBOL programs to MAPPER/MAPPER NT on UNIX, including writing the specs, translating into MAPPER runs and documenting the converted programs, for a U.S. military agency's budgeting system. UPP has additionally provided MAPPER programming and support services to industry. This includes, for instance, Unisys MAPPER development and maintenance as well as modification for conversion to IBM platforms, Oracle

and SAP applications for a leading sports and fitness company. And also MAPPER application and user support, along with modifying MAPPER-C database systems and performing Run Design for systems updates using MAPPER Presentation Client, for a nuclear power facility.

The application at page 3 states: "In a preferred embodiment **where the application software is MAPPER** from Unisys Corporation, and the operating system is a version of Microsoft's Windows, the table in the form of a "registry." "

(The application also states that the invention is not limited to MAPPER version handling).

It seems fairly clear that a software application or application software is something that runs something for a client. It is a program with instructions rather than something that is a mere collection of data without a set of instructions. This understanding is assumed for all 21 appearances of the word pair in the application.

The Appellant's inventive system works by looking up in a table the correspondence between application software versions and the Site ID from which a request comes, and then assigning or linking the request for applications software to the version of applications software unique to the site that requested it to that user request.

The Appellant does not have any disagreement with the Office's finding that the elements of the claims are in Madrane, but the Appellant believes the combination is not seen in Madrane. Rather, the rejection improperly connects the elements in the way the Applicant claims them even though these elements are not so linked in Madrane. Accordingly, having identified the only words of the claims that appear to have been misused in the rejection of the claims, the Appellant points out where these combinations are found in the application under review in this proceeding.

2. Combination of Elements

The claims explicitly all use a program for receiving requests by users to use a software application program version, except for claim 13. Claim 13 is a method claim which merely receives a user request that has a SiteID in it that is used to link the request to the right version (said one version) of the software application program. This method claim is limited in the preamble to assigning requests to particular versions of a software application program. (APPENDIX EXHIBIT B contains Claim 13.)

Accordingly, the Appellant identifies where the "versions" are identified in the application as meaning software application versions, and where SiteID is defined in the application, and where the connection is made between the user request and the right version of the software application.

While not desiring to be limited to this single instance or definition and mindful of the reader's need for succinctness and clarity, the Appellant finds that all of these just mentioned components are identified in the description of the invention on page 6, lines 2-15. Thus:

> If the invention is implemented through the internet a web server will handle the listening function of the server program 51 in the server 41, which constantly "listens" to a port 58 that the users' systems (here requestors 42-44) will be sending REQ's into on the server 41. As illustrated in Fig. 2, the REQ will have a component of information that contains the SiteID, and this will be forwarded to a component program in the server we can call an Access Control Manager or ACM 52. The ACM will use this information to check a list or table like the table of Fig. 3 which will contain information indicating which application program version and which database this user requires for this request. The ACM will then spawn an instance of a communication process or program ComProc 53 which will handle the generation of a RESP to the REQ for this user. The ComProc will be connected to the appropriate version and pass information from the version back to the requestor after the version has handled the request.

Having identified where in the application the issues for appeal can be found that are present in the claims, the Appellant proceeds to the discussion of the issues at hand.

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-11 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as obvious over Madrane, and claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) over Madrane in view of Mutschler.

ARGUMENT

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

1. Black Letter Law.

The requirements for a prima facie case of anticipation under section 102 are very clear. Each and every element of the claim must be in the reference, either explicitly or inherently. Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) requires that "each and every element as set forth in the **[**5]** claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."" Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Since the application under review claims a system that accomplishes the assignment of specific versions of applications software to specific users via a table of SiteIDs, it would be important that the reference, in order to qualify under section 102 teach how to do this.

2. Inherency.

In the matter of IN RE ANTHONY J. ROBERTSON and CHARLES L. SCRIPPS At *169 F.3d 743, *; 1999 U.S. App. LEXIS 3224, **; 49 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1949,* The Appeals Court had identified as a question, whether a diaper closure means needed two or three fasteners and when the claims called for three.

> *The board below stated:* "Wilson (the reference) does not provide a separate fastening means to be used in disposing of the **[**4]** diaper. Instead, it suggests that disposal of the used diaper may be "easily accomplished" by rolling it up and employing the same fasteners used to attach the diaper to the wearer to form "a closed compact package for disposal."
>
> In holding that the invention claim 76 covers was anticipated by Wilson, the Board did not hold that Wilson set forth a third fastening means. Instead, it found that Wilson anticipated claim 76 "under principles of inherency." Applying the language of claim 76 to the operation of Wilson, it concluded that "an artisan would readily understand the disposable absorbent garment of Wilson . . . as being inherently capable of [making the secondary load-bearing closure means] (third fastening element) mechanically engageable with [the other snap fasteners on the fastening strip] (first fastening element)" - i.e., using the secondary closure not with its mate, but with one of the primary snap fasteners. The Board summarily affirmed the examiner's alternative ruling that claim 76 would have been obvious in light of Wilson because "claim 76 lacks novelty." "

The court stated..." the Board ruled that one of the fastening means for attaching the diaper to the wearer also could operate as a third fastening means to close the diaper for disposal and that Wilson therefore inherently contained all the elements of claim 76. In doing so, the Board

> failed to recognize that the third mechanical fastening means in claim 76, used to secure the diaper for disposal, was separate from and independent of the two other mechanical means used to attach the diaper to the person. The Board's theory that **[**7]** these two fastening devices in Wilson were capable of being intermingled to perform the same function as the third and first fastening elements in claim 76 is insufficient to show that the latter device was inherent in Wilson." as it reversed the Board's decision.

Appellant cites the Robertson and Scripps decision because the examiner in the case under review appears to have assumed into existence the connections of user requests to application software versions that exist in the claims, but are not found in the Madrane reference. Accordingly, the Patent Office case depends upon inherency; inherency that has not been shown.

3. Review of the Rejection

Madrane *does* have versions of software applications mentioned where the examiner says they are mentioned. (col 16, lines 34-35). However, Madrane *does not* have any connection between these versions of software applications and user requests, the reason de etre for the applicant's invention.

The table that the examiner says provides a way to connect these versions to the requests through SiteIDs associated with the requests, the examiner says are at "(col 72, lies 40-41)" (Final Rejection, page 3 APPENDIX EXHIBIT E). Looking at this citation, we see no indication of software version tracking. Instead there is a Site table identifying sites, but no connection in that table to software versions. In the application under review the applicant has stated at page 3 lines 3-6. "A particular version is associated with one or more SiteIDs. A user request specifies the desired SiteID, and a table in the server is consulted to keep track of which SiteID corresponds to which version and to assign each request to the appropriate version. A directory or registry must be

set up to accommodate the table which must be consulted for each request, thus creating a mapping and a link to call the program and associated data for the SiteID."

The rejection says there is a correspondences logically connecting a one of said more than one version to a one of said plurality of sites (same paragraph on page 3 of the Final Rejection) but looking at all of the string of cites within that pharse, one cannot see such a connection. "Logically connecting" is said to be at col 22, lines 61-62, which in fact says "An Obvious Site (or site) is a logical group of services that manage a set of OBVIs with the same security policy." The Examiner's cite in Madrane to show "A one of said more than one version" is "Col 34, lines 40-43." This describes OBVI version management. However, OBVI's are defined as a "hypermedia container (Col 28, lines 15-17, Madrane). An OBVI is NOT application software. It is a data object, not a program. Thus, managing OBVIs is not managing software application versions. Still, the examiner cites col 16, lines 34-35 to say that Madrane is "of a said software application program." While those lines in Madrane do say that about different versions of "the application program" are associated with "the interface data file (and script if present)", these lines are NOT related to the OBVI version handling. It is as if the examiner has picked out unrelated sections of the Madrane reference and strung them together to meet the words of the claims without making any attempt to connect them in a manner in which the claims connect their elements. These last two citations are 18 columns apart with no connecting thoughts in between. The Madrane reference is 90 columns long. Surely someone can string together patches of words from a 90-column patent that describes managing data objects and also in an unrelated way mentions using different versions of a software program for managing different kinds of interfaces. However, this is not the test for anticipation. Madrane does not teach any method or system for managing the versions of software applications and ensuring that only the right ones, as identified by SiteID are connected to user requests.

Instead, Madrane, where it mentions versions of application programs says...(in col 16, lines 37 et seq, just after the examiner's citation)... " depending upon the interface functions which are to be supported. Thus, if no script is associated with the interface data file, the application program does not require routines handling the running of scripts... ...If the interface designer believes that the end user is likely already to have an application program suitable for running interfaces according to the present invention then he may choose not to package an application program with the interface data file or else to associate the interface data file merely information which identifies a suitable version of application program for running this particular interface. " Thus, the version handling of software applications is NOT done by the Madrane invention, it is handled by the interface designer. There is NO record in any table in Madrane of application software versions that can be tracked or used to link the user requests to particular applications software versions.

Accordingly, the Patent Office has not met its burden of establishing a prima facie case, since the elements of the claim are not found performing the functions they are assigned in the applicant's claims 1-11 and 13-18.

4. Obviousness of claim 12.

Because the section 102 reference fails to provide a valid basis for rejecting the base claims, this dependent claim 12 should also be allowed.

CONCLUSION

The Madrane reference does not show how to connect software application versions to user requests because it does not show any table that corresponds SiteID's to software application versions through which such coordination could be facilitated. Accordingly, the Madrane reference is inadequate at law under Section 102.

REMARKS

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Board find the claims allowable over Madrane, reversing the Examiner's rejection of all claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 16, 2004

Michael B. Atlass
Registration No. 30,606

Unisys Corporation
Unisys Way
M/S E8-114
Blue Bell, PA 19424
Telephone: (215) 986-4111
Facsimile: (215) 986-3090

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
APPEAL TO THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of: **Horton, John, C., et al.**
Serial No.: **09/738,852**
Filing Date: **12/15/2000**
For: **CONTROLLING ACCESS TO VERSIONS OF APPLICATION SOFTWARE BY A SERVER, BASED ON SITE ID**

Confirmation No.: **1674**
Docket No. **RA-5373**
Group Art Unit: **2154**
Examiner: **Siddiqi, Mohammad A.**

APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER
OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MARCH 20, 2001

PTAS

101578216

UNISYS CORPORATION
MICHAEL B. ATLASS
M.S. 4773
PO BOX 64942
ST. PAUL, MN 55164-0942

8373

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
NOTICE OF RECORDATION OF ASSIGNMENT DOCUMENT

THE ENCLOSED DOCUMENT HAS BEEN RECORDED BY THE ASSIGNMENT DIVISION OF THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE. A COMPLETE MICROFILM COPY IS AVAILABLE AT THE ASSIGNMENT SEARCH ROOM ON THE REEL AND FRAME NUMBER REFERENCED BELOW.

PLEASE REVIEW ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS NOTICE. THE INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS RECORDATION NOTICE REFLECTS THE DATA PRESENT IN THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK ASSIGNMENT SYSTEM. IF YOU SHOULD FIND ANY ERRORS OR HAVE QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS NOTICE, YOU MAY CONTACT THE EMPLOYEE WHOSE NAME APPEARS ON THIS NOTICE AT 703-308-9723. PLEASE SEND REQUEST FOR CORRECTION TO: U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE, ASSIGNMENT DIVISION, BOX ASSIGNMENTS, CG-4, 1213 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY, SUITE 320, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231.

RECORDATION DATE: 12/15/2000
REEL/FRAME: 011406/0729
NUMBER OF PAGES: 4

BRIEF: ASSIGNMENT OF ASSIGNOR'S INTEREST (SEE DOCUMENT FOR DETAILS).

ASSIGNOR:
HORTON, JOHN C.
DOC DATE: 12/14/2000

ASSIGNOR:
CARPENTIER, DAVID E.
DOC DATE: 12/14/2000

ASSIGNOR:
SMITH, DONALD G.
DOC DATE: 12/14/2000

ASSIGNOR:
STEIGERWALD, CHARLES D.
DOC DATE: 12/14/2000

ASSIGNEE:
UNISYS CORPORATION
M.S. 4773, PO BOX 64942
ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55164-0942

SERIAL NUMBER: 09738852
FILING DATE: 12/15/2000
PATENT NUMBER:
ISSUE DATE:

SONYA JOHNSON, EXAMINER
ASSIGNMENT DIVISION
OFFICE OF PUBLIC RECORDS

Form PTO-1595
(Rev. 6-94)

01-11-2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

REC  EET

101578215

jc914 U.S. PTO
09/738852
12/15/00

To the Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks. Please record the attached original documents or copy thereof.

1. Name of conveying party(ies):

John C. Horton
David E. Carpentier
Donald G. Smith
Charles D. Steigerwald

12/15/00

2. Name and address of receiving party(ies):

UNISYS Corporation
M.S. 4773
PO Box 64942
St. Paul, MN 55164-0942

Additional name(s) & address(es) attached?
☐ Yes ☑ No

3. Nature of Conveyance:

☑ Assignment
☐ Change of Name
☐ Merger
☐ Security Agreement
☐ Other

09/738852

Execution Date: 12/14/2000

Additional name(s) of conveying party(ies) attached?
☐ Yes ☑ No

4. Application number(s) or patent number(s):

If this document is being filed together with a new application, the execution date of the application is: 12/14/2000.

A. Patent Application No.(s)
RA-5373

B. Patent No.(s)

Additional numbers attached? ☐ Yes ☑ No

5. Name and address of party to whom correspondence concerning document should be mailed:

UNISYS Corporation
Attn: Michael B. Atlass
M.S. 4773
PO Box 64942
St. Paul, MN 55164-0942

6. Total number of applications and patents involved:
1

7. Total fee (37 CFR 3.41) $ 40.00
☐ Enclosed
☑ Authorized to be charged to Deposit Account

8. Deposit Account Number: 19-3790
(Attach duplicate copy of this page if paying by deposit account.)

9. Statement and signature.

To the best of my knowledge and belief, the foregoing information is true and correct and any attached copy is a true copy of the original document.

Michael B. Atlass
Name of Person Signing

Signature

December 15, 2000
Date

Total number of pages including cover sheet, attachments, and document: 4

01/10/2001 AAHMED1 00000118 193790 09738852
01 FC:581 40.00 CH

Mail documents to be recorded with required cover sheet information to:
Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Box Assignments, Washington, D.C. 20231

(Form PTO - 1595 - Recordation Form Cover Sheet [16-5])

ASSIGNMENT

WHEREAS, we, John C. Horton, residing at 1259 Sargent Avenue, St. Paul (Ramsey County), Minnesota 55105; David E. Carpentier, residing at 529 Hawthorn Road, Lino Lakes (Anoka County), Minnesota 55014; Donald G. Smith, residing at 680 Continental Drive, New Brighton (Ramsey County), Minnesota 55112; and Charles D. Steigerwald, residing at 4904 Upper 148th Court, Apple Valley (Dakota County), Minnesota 55124, are inventor's of the inventions of the patent application for United States patent entitled ***"CONTROLLING ACCESS TO VERSION OF APPLICATION SOFTWARE BY A SERVER, BASED ON SITE ID"***;

WHEREAS, Unisys Corporation, a corporation of the state of Delaware having a place of business at Township Line and Union Meeting Roads, Blue Bell, Pennsylvania 19424, is desirous of acquiring the entire right, title and interest in said inventions, said application and in any patents which may be granted thereon;

NOW THEREFORE, for valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, we hereby assign, sell and transfer unto said Unisys Corporation, its successors and assigns (hereinafter "Assignee"), our entire right, title and interest in and to all inventions disclosed in said application, in and to said application and in and to any patents for the United States of America, its territories and possessions and all foreign countries resulting from said inventions and said patent application, including all divisions, continuations, reissues and extensions thereof, all rights to claim priority based thereon, all rights to file foreign applications on said inventions, and all patents, reissues and extensions thereof, issuing for said invention in the United States of America and in any and all foreign countries.

I [we] hereby grant to Assignee the right to apply in its own name for patents corresponding to the above inventions in countries foreign to the United States, and all priority rights resulting from the above-identified United States patent application. we hereby authorize and request the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks to issue any and all patents that may be granted for said inventions to Assignee, and we agree that we and our successors, assigns or legal representatives thereof, shall be legally bound without additional compensation (except for any statutory fee applicable to witnesses), but without cost to us, to promptly communicate to Assignee or its representatives, all facts known to us or in our possession respecting said inventions whenever requested, to testify in any legal proceedings, to sign all lawful papers, execute all divisional, continuing and reissue applications, to make all rightful oaths and to generally aid our said Assignee, its successors and assigns, as and when requested by them, in obtaining in the name of the Assignee and in enforcing proper patent protection for said inventions on behalf of the Assignee, in the United States and all countries foreign thereto.

We hereby covenant that no assignment, sale, agreement or encumbrance has been or will be made or entered into which conflicts, or would be in conflict, with this Assignment.

The parties hereto acknowledge that they have specifically requested the present agreement to be drawn up in the English language.

Les parties aux presentes declarent que le present acte a ete redige en anglais a leur demande expresse.

INVENTOR

John C. Horton 12/14/00
(Inventor's Typed Name) *(Inventor's Signature)* *(Date)*

STATE OF Minnesota
COUNTY OF Ramsey

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 14th **day of December, 2000,** by John C. Horton.

CANDACE L. KLYM
Notary Public
Minnesota
My Commission Expires Jan. 31, 2005

Notary Public

(SEAL)

INVENTOR

David E. Carpentier 12/14/00
(Inventor's Typed Name) *(Inventor's Signature)* *(Date)*

STATE OF Minnesota
COUNTY OF Ramsey

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 14th **day of December, 2000,** by David E. Carpentier.

CANDACE L. KLYM
Notary Public
Minnesota
My Commission Expires Jan. 31, 2005

Notary Public

(SEAL)

INVENTOR

Donald G. Smith
(Inventor's Typed Name)

Donald G Smith 12/14/2000
(Inventor's Signature) *(Date)*

STATE OF Minnesota
COUNTY OF Ramsey

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 14th **day of December, 2000,** by Donald G. Smith.

CANDACE L. KLYM
Notary Public
Minnesota
My Commission Expires Jan. 31, 2005

Candace L. Klym
Notary Public

(SEAL)

INVENTOR

Charles D. Steigerwald
(Inventor's Typed Name)

Charles D Steigerwald Dec 14, 200
(Inventor's Signature) *(Date)*

STATE OF Minnesota
COUNTY OF Ramsey

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 14th **day of December, 2000,** by Charles D. Steigerwald.

CANDACE L. KLYM
Notary Public
Minnesota
My Commission Expires Jan. 31, 2005

Candace L. Klym
Notary Public

(SEAL)

EXHIBIT B

Claim 1:

1. (Original) A System for assigning each one of a plurality of versions of a software application to specific requests from specific users handled by a server, wherein more than one of said plurality of versions of a said software application is available to service requests from users on said server, and wherein said specific users are provided access to said server by issuing requests to said server, and wherein said requests have a SiteID code in each said request, said system comprising:

a network listening program for receiving said requests by said users for use of a said software application program version,

a table on said server containing correspondences between ones of a plurality of sites and ones of said SiteID codes said correspondences logically connecting a one of said more than one version of a said software application program to a one of said plurality of sites indicated by said SiteID code, wherein said one of said plurality of sites has only one of said more than one version of a said software application program and at least one data area,

an access control manager program for determining which one of said more than one version of a said software application program should be connected to each user request by reference to said table,

a linking program for linking said a request to a site.

Claim 2:

2. (Original) The System of claim 1 wherein said table is a registry in a Microsoft Windows operating system.

Claim 3:

3. (Original) The system of claim 1 wherein said access control manager program is part of said network listening program.

Claim 4:

4. (Original) The system of claim 3 wherein said linking program is part of said network listening program.

Claim 5:

5. (Original) The system of claim 1 wherein said network listening program comprises a web server.

Claim 6:

6. (Original) The system of claim 1 further comprising an auxiliary recording program for monitoring each request for ones of said plurality of sites and recording user information related to said each request.

Claim 7:

7. (Original) The system of claim 6 wherein said auxiliary recording program supports billing programs that can bill for client usage of particular ones of said plurality of sites.

Claim 8:

8. (Original) The system of claim 6 wherein said auxiliary recording program supports maintenance programs that improve server performance.

Claim 9:

9. (Original) The system of claim 1 further comprising a linking program for communicating requests and responses between a one of said plurality of sites and said client after a first request is handled by said network listener program.

Claim 10:

10. (Original) The system of claim 9 wherein said access control manager program spawns said linking program based on a said first request.

Claim 11:

11. (Original) The system of claim 1 wherein said software application is a database application.

Claim 12:

12. (Original) The system of claim 11 wherein said software application is the program called MAPPER substantially as presently available Unisys.

Claim 13:

13. (Original) A System for assigning each one of a plurality of versions of a software application to specific requests from specific users handled by a server, wherein more than one of said plurality of versions of a said software application is available to service requests from users on said server, and wherein said specific users are provided access to said server by issuing requests to said server, and wherein said requests have a SiteID code means in each said request, said system comprising:

a network listening means for receiving said requests from a network connected to said server by said users on said network for use of a said software application program version,

a table means on said server containing correspondences between ones of a plurality of site means and ones of said SiteID code means said correspondences logically connecting a one of said more than one version of a said software application program to a one of said plurality of site means indicated by said SiteID code means, wherein said one of said plurality of site

means has only one of said more than one version of a said software application program and at least one data area,

an access control manager means for determining which one of said more than one version of a said software application program should be connected to each user request by reference to said table means,

a linking program means for linking said a request to a site means.

Claim 14:

14. (Currently Amended) A method for assigning requests to particular versions of a software application program where multiple versions of said software application program are maintained for servicing requests on a server comprising:

receiving a user request at a server,

reading a SiteID code identifying a user site from within said user request,

determining with reference to a table which one of a plurality of versions of a software application program on said server is indicated by said request,

linking said request to said one version.

Claim 15:

15. (Original) The method of claim 14 wherein said linking further comprises;

forwarding information from said request from a network listening program which performed said receiving step to a logical site on said server containing at least said one version,

allowing said one version to process said information from said request and formulate a response responsive thereto,

and

returning said response to said user.

Claim 16:

16. (Original) The method of claim 15 wherein said returning step comprises:

passing said response to a communications program and communicating by said communications program information from said response to said user.

Claim 17:

17. (Original) The method of claim 15 further comprising:

spawning an independent communications process for handling communications between said site and said user.

Claim 18:

18. (Original) The method of claim 14 further comprising sending information identifying said user as having been connected to said one site to an auxiliary program.

EXHIBIT C

ABSTRACT

A plurality of versions of software application programs can be handled by a single server serving multiple user-clients who each need access to specific ones of the plurality of versions. Thus such different versions can run simultaneously without requiring upgrading of early versions and no interference between versions. A particular version is given a SiteID that a user request calls, and a table in the server is consulted to keep track of which SiteID corresponds to which version and to assign each request to the appropriate version. A directory or registry must be set up to accommodate the table which must be consulted for each request. No significant change need be made in any version of the software application program since the table is created at installation time on the server and the SiteID's are assigned to the users when they get rights to the particular version of interest by an administrator. In a preferred embodiment, a SiteID identifies (and the "site" embodies) a collection of databases that the user may need access to. One and only one application software version is associated with a SiteID. Accessing a table that maps the SiteID to a particular version can be monitored and additional programs run responsive to information about such access.

EXHIBIT D

Abstract (Madrane)

Interactive interfaces to video information provide a displayed view of a quasi-object called a root image. The root image consists of a plurality of basic frames selected from the video information, arranged such that their respective x and y directions are aligned with the x and y directions in the root image and the z direction in the root image corresponds to time, such that base frames are spaced apart in the z direction of the root image in accordance with their time separation. The displayed view of the root image changes in accordance with a designated viewing position, as if the root image were a three-dimensional object. The user can manipulate the displayed image by designating different viewing positions, selecting portions of the video information for playback and by special effects, such as cutting open the quasi-object for a better view. A toolkit permits interface designers to design such interfaces, notably so as to control the types of interaction which will be possible between the interface and an end user. Implementations of the interfaces including editors and viewers are also disclosed.

EXHIBIT E

of a said software application (col 16, lines 34-35) is available to service requests from users on said server (col 31, lines 45-59), and wherein said specific users are provided access to said server by issuing requests to said server (col 31, lines 45-59), and wherein said requests have a SiteID code (col 22, lines 60-67) in each said request (col 49, lines 8-35), said system comprising:

a network (col 23, lines 34-35) listening program for receiving said requests by said users for use of a said software application program (col 16, lines 34-35) version (col 50, lines 13-14),

a table (col 72, lies 40-41) on said server (col 23, lines 10-14) containing correspondences between ones of a plurality of sites (col 22, lines 60-64) and ones of said SiteID codes (col 23, lines 20-27) said correspondences logically connecting (col 22, lines 61-62) a one of said more than one version (col 34,lines 40-43) of a said software application program (col 16, lines 34-35) to a one of said plurality of sites (col 23, lines 4-8) indicated by said SiteID code (col 23, lines 20-27), wherein said one of said plurality of sites has only one of said more than one (col 40, lines 55-56) version of a said software application program (col 23, lines 58-59 and col 16, lines 34-35) and at least one data area (col 22, lines 40-50),

an access control manager (col 42, lines 65- -67) program for determining which one of said more than one version (col 42, lines 52-55) of

EXHIBIT F

Segment of column 16 from line 34 to line 50.

Different versions of the application program can be associated with the interface data file (and script, if present) depending upon the interface functions which are to be supported. Thus, if no script is associated with the interface data file, the application program does not require routines handling the running of scripts. Similarly, if the interface data file does not permit an accordion effect to be performed by the end user then the application program does not need to include routines required for calculating display information for such effects. If the interface designer believes that the end user is likely already to have an application program suitable for running interfaces according to the present invention then he may choose not to package an application program with the interface data file or else to associate with the interface data file merely information which identifies a suitable version of application program for running this particular interface.